

Section III:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the
DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

Section IV:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121
REMARKS

Nature of Amendment

Reopening of Examination

We appreciate the reopening of examination following our appeal, and the withdrawal of the previous rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Our amendment to the step ". . . *directing a booking party to a set of web objects according to a type of booking party . . .* " further specifies our process of *redirecting* a customer from a primary site to *one of several* clone sites, where each clone reservation site is tailored to meet the needs of a different customer type. As such, if there are three customer types – (1) a wholesale booking party, (2) an agent booking party, and (3) a direct customer party – our system would have a primary site and three clone sites. As each customer attempts to establish a reservation booking session with the primary site, the session is redirected to one of the clone sites according to the customer's type. Our amendment is commensurate with our figures 2 and 3, and our paragraphs 0022, 0030, 0048, and 0054, so no new matter is added.

We believe this is non-obvious in view of the cited references because there is an unexpected increase in customer affinity with the reservation system and process because each clone server can present information in a manner and sequence suitable for a particular customer type. For example, if you are an individual consumer (not a travel agent), a reservation system arranged in a manner such as Expedia or Orbitz can be very useful and natural to use because its screens and forms are designed with the assumption that (a) you do not know a lot of travel industry jargon, lingo or abbreviations, (b) you do not have a lot of reservations for a lot of people to book, and (c) your trip is fairly uncomplicated (e.g. no open airfare or "dog leg" routes, etc.)

However, if you are a travel agent or even a wholesale travel agent, these assumptions are invalid, and your experience trying to book 10, 20 or even more reservations for multiple

traveler, and to book complicated routes and itineraries would be much different. Knowing the industry jargon and abbreviations (e.g. airport codes, seat types, etc.), a web site which allows bulk entry of data and free from definitions of travel routes would be much more useful and efficient.

Providing programming for such a variety of user interfaces for small entities (e.g. individual hotels instead of large chain hotels) could be cost prohibitive.

We believe our invention provides such a variety of customer-tuned interfaces and booking processes, each hosted by a clone site. We believe our method of redirecting customers to the appropriate clone cite, and for synchronizing the clones to the primary, yields an unexpectedly efficient system to configure, deploy, operate and use, thereby creating surprisingly strong affinity for the system with both the operators/owners (e.g. hotels, ships, event operators, etc.) and the users (e.g. individual consumers, travel agents, and wholesale travel parties).

We believe Mankes only discloses and shows a single ARS, where data for different booking party types is segregated by password protection. We believe Mankes is silent regarding providing a clone server for each type of booking party, tailoring the user interface to each clone reservation system to a specific booking party, and using redirection to route each user to an appropriate clone reservation system. Our multiple-clone with redirection approach provides several advantages over such a single, password-segregated approach, including better ability to scale growth of the system for each type of booking party, better ability to load balance the systems, and greater degree of flexibility to tailor the user interfaces to each booking party type.

For these reasons, we believe our claims are non-obvious over the cited art. We respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

We believe that the present amendment which specifies providing a plurality of clones, each clone being tailored to one of three or more customer types, and redirecting each reservation booking session to a clone according to the customer type clarifies the language which was the subject of the rejection under §112, 2nd paragraph.

Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz
U.S. Patent Agent, Reg. N^o 42,553
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC